

SITES 1 AND 2 LANDFILL CONSOLIDATION
MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD PUBLIC HEARING
7:15 p.m., THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1997

ORIGINAL

R E P O R T E R ' S T R A N S C R I P T

Reported by: Virginia Alejandro, CSR
Cert. No. 9791

HARRY A. CANNON, INC.

Certified Reporters and Notaries

SACRAMENTO STREET TOWER
550 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104
TELEPHONE (415) 391-7411
FAX (415) 391-4978

3163

I N D E X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

SITES 1 AND 2 LANDFILL CONSOLIDATION
MOFFETT FEDERAL AIRFIELD PUBLIC MEETING
March 20, 1997

1 MR. CHAO: I'd like to welcome you all here
2 tonight.

3 We're going to have a presentation on the
4 recommended remedy for cleanup of two of the
5 landfills at Moffett Field.

6 I'm Stephen Chao and I'm the Navy
7 Environmental Coordinator for Moffett Field.

8 I'd like to go over the agenda for
9 tonight. We'll have a presentation by Brian
10 Werle who's a Navy contractor for Moffett
11 Field. And he'll be talking about the selection
12 process that has led us to the recommended
13 remedy for tonight.

14 After that, we're going to have clarifying
15 questions on the presentation and answers.

16 We'll then have a break, about 10, 15
17 minutes so that we can write down comments on
18 the 3 by 5 cards up in the front there.

19 And after the break, we'll ask you to read
20 your comments aloud. And if you don't want to
21 read your comments aloud, we'll have someone
22 read them for you.

23 As everybody can see, we have a court
24 reporter down here in front. So I'd like to go
25 over some of the ground rules for tonight.

1 We'd like you to stand up and state your
2 name and affiliation. And when you are reading
3 your comments, please come down here to read
4 those comments.

5 And if there is going to be a lot of
6 comments for this evening, I don't think there
7 will be, but we'll have a five minute limit on
8 each of the comments.

9 But rest assured that all of the comments
10 will be incorporated into the record of decision
11 which is the legal binding document that records
12 the recommended remedy for tonight to the
13 landfills, and they will be responded to in
14 writing also in that record of decision.

15 You also have another chance to comment up
16 until April the 11th. And those comments can be
17 sent to Don Chuck who's a member of our staff.

18 Don is located at Moffett Field and his
19 address is included in the brochure, if you
20 didn't get a copy on the table in the front
21 there. So he will be accepting comments up
22 until April the 11th.

23 Before I go through that, I'd like to
24 introduce Mike Gill from EPA, Mr. Young from
25 DTSC, Department of Toxics Substance Control Cal

HARRY A. CANNON, CSR, INC.
(415) 391-7421 FAX (415) 391-4978

1 EPA, and also, I guess, Steve, who's the only
2 member of the Restoration Advisory Board here
3 tonight.

4 And I guess everybody knows about the
5 Restoration Advisory Board. It's a citizens
6 group that helps the Navy and the agencies
7 review and comment on the Navy's cleanup process
8 at Moffett Field.

9 I'd like to go over some of the background
10 about this evening's presentation. There have
11 been previous meetings to talk about the
12 recommended remedies for these two landfills.

13 Previously, landfill caps were recommended
14 for landfill Sites 1 and 2. And in the
15 meantime, there had been some additional
16 investigations done at the site to further help
17 in the design for the landfill caps.

18 And during that process, we found that the
19 original estimate of 169,000 cubic yards
20 approximately of debris is actually about 20,000
21 cubic yards.

22 And with that information in mind, a
23 decision was made to actually move, consolidate
24 landfill number 2 into landfill number 1 and put
25 a multilayer cap only on landfill number 1. And

1 that will save approximately \$300,000 in costs
2 for not having to cap landfill number 2.

3 And more importantly, it will allow for
4 greater reuse, potential reuse for landfill
5 number 2 which is approximately five acres in
6 size.

7 And with that, I'll turn it over to Brian
8 to give his presentation.

9 MR. WERLE: Thanks, Steve. I think you
10 have about covered it all.

11 Steve mentioned this is not the first
12 public meeting we've had. Rather, this is the
13 third public meeting we've had on the
14 landfills.

15 Really what we're focusing on is not
16 necessarily a change in the remedy. We're still
17 going to be applying a cap over the landfill.
18 But we are now talking about consolidating.

19 We're still applying the same remedy that
20 we went through a long process to get to. It's
21 just with some new information, we're going to
22 try to improve the plan we already have.

23 Here is a figure of Moffett Field and the
24 numerous sites out there that we have been
25 looking at. And Sites 1 and 2, you can see kind

1 see kind of highlighted up farther here are the
2 two landfill sites that we're talking about
3 tonight.

4 Site 1 is the larger of the landfills. And
5 Site 2 is the smaller one which was the focus of
6 some of the investigative work we did earlier.

7 There is the relationship of Moffett
8 Field. And highway 101 runs right down here.
9 Here is a closeup here. Here is a closeup of
10 the two landfills that were on the other
11 figure.

12 I'll talk a little bit about our
13 background; how we got here, some of the events
14 that have occurred, what the basis was for our
15 modification to a plan that we already came to
16 an agreement on, an alternative analysis that we
17 did to look at what options we had, summarized
18 revised proposal and some things that are
19 occurring next.

20 Spring '95, we completed our RI/FS work,
21 the remedial investigation and feasibility study
22 work. And based on that, when we investigate a
23 landfill -- EPA has looked at hundreds of
24 landfill sites, and through that process
25 determined that the best thing for the larger

1 landfills is to just go ahead and cap them, put
2 a cover over them rather than extensively
3 investigate them or try to dig them up.

4 And they have had numerous sites that they
5 have gone through the process from and they have
6 determined that's probably the best way to
7 handle it.

8 They always kept coming back to the same
9 answer; go ahead and put a cover over it.

10 So with that in mind, our remedial
11 investigation and feasibility study was kind of
12 streamlined and structured towards that.

13 Based on that feasibility study which is a
14 study to look at different alternatives of ways
15 to close the site out, we pretty much focused on
16 that streamline process of just covering the
17 landfills.

18 From that, the Navy proposed just putting a
19 simple soil cover over both the landfills. Just
20 determined they weren't really that hazardous.

21 Then we had a public meeting like this.
22 This was the first public meeting. And based on
23 the comments we got from that -- it was mostly
24 the comments from the agencies and public, felt
25 that we should close these landsfills in a

1 similar manner that they do to landfills in the
2 surrounding areas; the cities do in Mountain
3 View and Palo Alto.

4 They have their own landfills. And really
5 what those are are multilayered covers which
6 have different layers in them to prevent water
7 from coming into them. And they are a little
8 more solid or prevent things from getting into
9 them.

10 So in the fall of '95, we revised our plan
11 based on those comments to do multilayered
12 covers at both sites.

13 And through some other comments, we put in
14 a contingency plan of putting in a groundwater
15 and landfill gas collection trenches around Site
16 1 because there was some potential for
17 groundwater contamination and some gas
18 migration.

19 Although it's not occurring, there could be
20 a potential. And it was felt that a safety
21 measure was needed.

22 In the fall of '96, we started doing some
23 field work to gather some design information.
24 We did some exploratory trenches and we wanted
25 to help identify where the landfill boundaries

1 were and to help us precisely locate a natural
2 gasline at Site 2.

3 This is a gasline that kind of runs through
4 the middle of the site here. And we wanted to
5 find out where exactly the boundaries were.

6 The previous remedial investigation had
7 assumed that the landfill occupied the entire
8 site here. And that was the premise that we
9 based our previous work on.

10 So we wanted to go outside and try to
11 verify that that was happening as we were trying
12 to design the cover over that site.

13 As it turned out by putting exploratory
14 trenches in, we found the waste was not as
15 extensive as we thought. We figured it would go
16 all the way out to the edges. However, it was
17 pretty much isolated right in this small area.
18 And through some of the borings and trenches, we
19 estimated that the waste was quite a bit
20 smaller.

21 As Steve mentioned, the earlier estimates
22 of around 170,000 yards went down to about
23 20,000 yards, a significant difference. It
24 actually makes the landfill small enough to
25 consider other options for it.

1 The other things we identified, as you see
2 in the slide, waste is in two different areas;
3 pretty much kind of contained there, and that
4 it's fairly easy to distinguish from the native
5 soils around there.

6 So this one is put down. It's put down
7 into two areas. And you can kind of see from
8 the soils around it where the waste was and
9 where it wasn't.

10 Based on that, we decided to look at the
11 alternatives of whether we go ahead and do a cap
12 at Site 2 or if we should consider doing
13 something else with it.

14 Aside from just capping it in place, the
15 most likely option was to move it up to Site 1,
16 which we know is a much larger landfill. And we
17 were doing a cap on that anyway.

18 We did kick around at looking at excavating
19 and moving offsite. That really didn't make
20 sense to move it to another landfill when we are
21 closing our own landfill onsite.

22 The analysis that we used was the same kind
23 of analysis we do in a feasibility study. It
24 centered around nine criteria the EPA uses to
25 look at different kinds of cleanup options. And

1 we evaluate each of the alternatives based on
2 those criteria.

3 The summary of that report or the analysis
4 kind of shows that both options; capping in
5 place or moving it to Site 1 protects human
6 health and environment.

7 The material, the waste material is still
8 contained and isolated from people coming in
9 contact with it. Both the options satisfy
10 applicable laws.

11 And as far as long-term effectiveness; how
12 well each option does over time, consolidation
13 probably offers us a little bit better options.
14 It allows us, once we move the material from
15 Site 2 and place it in Site 1 and then
16 essentially regrade and put the site back to a
17 flat condition, there is a greater range of uses
18 for it.

19 We also don't have to do operation and
20 maintenance on Site 2. If we had a cap there, a
21 cover there, we have to take care of the
22 vegetation and soil, cover and maintain drainage
23 over the site for 30 years or so. So by moving
24 it, we don't have to do that.

25 The other thing, too, is the waste at Site

1 2 is in the groundwater right now. So if the
2 groundwater had moved up to or had been there
3 when they moved into the trash that had been put
4 there, and by taking it out of Site 2 and moving
5 it out to Site 1, we'll be placing it on top of
6 the landfill. So we'll have the waste there out
7 of the groundwater which is an added benefit.

8 As far as the short-term effectiveness, how
9 well this goes really during the construction
10 period; consolidation work may expose some
11 workers to the waste, which is really breathing
12 vapors and things like that from taking the dirt
13 off and exposing the waste. But it's fairly
14 commonly addressed by good health and safety
15 procedures.

16 We'll be having monitoring and kind of
17 respirators if that's needed. But they will be
18 monitored to make sure that everything is okay.

19 If we're going to go ahead and cap Site 2,
20 we'll have increased truck traffic bringing
21 materials in and construction equipment, things
22 like that.

23 And then the other point was that if we
24 constructed a cap, it would take a lot more
25 time, probably about three months longer to go

1 ahead and do that. So it appears on the
2 short-term, consolidation looks like a better
3 option.

4 Costs, as Steve mentioned, it would be a
5 little cheaper for us to consolidate by 300,000
6 or so. That's really, again, in saving in the
7 operation and maintenance, and also having to do
8 some long-term monitoring over that site over 30
9 years or so.

10 Another factor is regulatory agency
11 support. We developed this plan with EPA and
12 the State and came up with the options and
13 looked at it. We really had fairly good support
14 on doing something like this because we are
15 really eliminating one site from the whole
16 process and consolidating with another.

17 What is proposed? The proposal right now
18 is go ahead and cap Site 1 as previously
19 planned. We are not going to make any changes
20 to what we are doing at Site 1. So the comments
21 that we have received on these plans at the
22 other two public meetings are all still quite
23 valid. And the plans we made are still valid.

24 We're going to be putting a multilayered
25 cap over Site 1. We'll be installing a

1 groundwater and landfill gas collection trench.
2 And we'll be doing long-term groundwater and
3 landfill gas monitoring. So that hasn't
4 changed. We're still going to be doing that.

5 At Site 2, we're proposing just to excavate
6 the material and move to Site 1 before we cap
7 it, obviously, backfill and restore the site.
8 And then we'll be doing some groundwater
9 monitoring there for at least a minimum of three
10 years. That's to help verify that the action
11 we've taken hasn't caused a release, or there
12 are any future releases from that site.

13 What's next. As you know, right now we're
14 in a public comment period which lasts 30 days.
15 It started earlier this month and it goes to
16 April 11.

17 During the entire time, everyone is welcome
18 to provide comments. In addition to this
19 meeting, later you can write comments in to Don
20 Chuck whose address is on the proposed plan. So
21 we're really encouraging what comments you have
22 on the plan we're doing.

23 After that, we'll address those comments
24 and add those responses into the record of
25 decision which we'll be preparing also.

HARRY A. CANNON, CSR, INC.
(415) 391-7421 FAX (415) 391-4978

1 And the record of decision is the formal
2 document which, the administrative document that
3 says this is what we're going to do at the site
4 and holds us to doing that.

5 We're also starting a consolidation design
6 now. We've had some good support for doing
7 that. So we're starting some of the preliminary
8 design work now.

9 We expect to try to do the construction for
10 that later this year, towards the end of year.
11 And at the same time, once we start the
12 construction, we're also planning the design for
13 Site 1.

14 We're kind of phasing this project right
15 now to work with funding and to make sure we get
16 the conditions and what the shapes will be after
17 we do the consolidation.

18 And right now, we're looking at
19 constructing the cap at Site 1 in the summer of
20 '98.

21 So that's our general plan and things we're
22 doing with the site. And like I mentioned
23 earlier, this whole public meeting and the
24 public comment period is about this
25 consolidation.

1 You are certainly welcome to submit any of
2 comments about the plans we have. And some of
3 you may have not been a part of that earlier
4 process.

5 So if there is any question over what I
6 just went over, I'll be happy to answer any of
7 them.

8 Bob.

9 MR. MOSS: When you do restoration for Site
10 2, how are you going to actually verify the
11 waste and toxic material that you have there? I
12 know what you thought was there originally is
13 different from what you think is there now.

14 Are there any possibilities of problems
15 that you may have missed?

16 MR. WERLE: That's a good question. What
17 we found and I discussed a little earlier
18 through our exploratory trenching is that the
19 waste is really easy to identify because you can
20 see all this debris as opposed to soil near it.

21 From looking at some old, a number of old
22 aerial photographs and again looking at where
23 our borings are, it appears that the waste has
24 been centralized in those two locations here.

25 And that makes sense of about how they

1 disposed of the two. More than likely when they
2 brought things over there, they are going to put
3 it with all the other stuff right there. And
4 that appears to be what it was.

5 As we start doing the excavations, we're
6 going to find out. We're starting our
7 excavations in places we know the wastes are.
8 We're going out from there and getting
9 everything.

10 It's a fairly small site, too. So I think
11 it would be hard for us to miss a big chunk of
12 material there.

13 And the other aspect, too, is the
14 groundwater monitoring we'll be doing after we
15 close the site just to verify that nothing else
16 is still there that's getting into the
17 groundwater.

18 Any other question?

19 MR. MOSS: Are you going to do some
20 verification after you have excavated out?

21 MR. WERLE: We do have some plans to take
22 some samples from the excavation work once we
23 get done.

24 MR. YOUNG: Is the dewatering going to be
25 an issue as far as moving it without causing a

1 lot of problems in transport?

2 MR. WERLE: We are working on dewatering.
3 Dewatering will be an aspect of the project.
4 And right now, we're kind of working with what
5 options we have for doing that.

6 That's a proposal we need to work out with
7 the Water Board as to how to manage that water.
8 We may be able do use it in the construction
9 like dust control; something like that,
10 depending on how we could work that in.

11 Any other questions?

12 MR. CHAO: If not, we'll just go ahead and
13 take about like a quick five minute break to
14 allow everyone to write their comments down on
15 the 3 by 5 card. And we'll meet after that five
16 minutes and read your comments allowed.

17 (Recess taken)

18 MR. CHAO: Is everybody ready to read their
19 comments? Okay. Let's go ahead and start then.

20 Stand up and state your name and
21 affiliation.

22 MR. WOODHOUSE: Kevin Woodhouse. I'm the
23 Environmental Management Coordinator for the
24 City of Mountain View.

25 I don't have a specific comment about the

1 plan. I just want to say that the City staff is
2 reviewing the plan and will be commenting before
3 the end of the comment period. That's it.

4 MR. CHAO: Thank you.

5 Are there any other comments? Okay. So I
6 guess that should close things out for this
7 evening.

8 Again, I'd like to remind you you still
9 have time to send in your comments to Don
10 Chuck.

11 And if you didn't have a chance to get a
12 copy of the proposed plan, it's in the front
13 there. If you'd like to be a member of the rap,
14 Bob Moss is back there.

15 And thanks for coming tonight and we'll see
16 you at the next public meeting.

17 (Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.)
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2)

3 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

4

5 I hereby certify that the foregoing
6 transcript is a full, true, and correct
7 transcription of the proceedings of the date and
8 time therein stated.

9 And I further certify that I am not of
10 counsel or attorney for either or any of the
11 parties to said proceeding, nor in any way
12 interested in the outcome of the cause named in
13 said caption.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
15 set my hand the 31st day of March,
16 1997.

17

18

19

Virginia A. Alejandro

20

VIRGINIA A. ALEJANDRO, CSR. NO. 9791

21

22

23

24

25